

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701

3/7/76

Senator Richard Schweiker
Room 347
Old Senate Office Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Dick,

During the years I farmed I learned a little. This includes staying away from a stallion with the bit in his teeth.

So, when from time to time I heard from some of your witnesses before and after they testified, I resisted the temptation to be in touch. You made it clear your way that you will do your think and I made my position clear, I think.

When I knew of projects on which you were working I had still other reasons for not being in touch, the people involved.

You have been close to minor, peripheral matters that would have made black headlines. But not in context. I know because with several of these I did my work as much as eight years ago. Not counting the work to which I'll come, where I'll be specific enough, I hope.

I'm not being obdurate or selfish. If you recall our meeting I said there is nothing I would not do to help what I believe might succeed and that I'd have nothing to do with what I might believe would not. If events prove me wrong it will be one of the better ways to have been wrong, with someone else succeeding. But in the event this does not happen, for the time when I think it can I'm keeping my powder dry- and ready.

While I would appreciate it if after your committee's life is over you would let me have what might amplify my work, I do not expect it. I merely let you know that I would welcome it, on the chance that it can advance my my work and with the belief it will make the archive I will leave that much better. There are, I know, some things that have to be confidential.

Recently I have learned that some of the damage from the phlebitis is irreversible and serious. So, I try to restrict myself to what I believe may be more important. I am now writing a different book, in part because I believe that what has been done with the JFK assassination has dimmed prospects for a while. As well as what was not done.

I'm told Saffire writes that you are going to report the belief that Castro had JFK killed. If you had done the work I have you would not believe it. I finished the research for that book in 1965 and decided, rightly or wrongly, that I had to do other writing instead. I'll return to it when I can.

This whole thing, I'm confident, is a disinformation operation sometimes quite ~~app~~ sophisticated, sometimes transparently lacking ~~any~~ reasonableness.

I've delayed writing you about this until getting a copy of the original Green-spun story. It is trash, I suspect of Maheu's inspiration.

As people we tend to live the way we are conditioned to by Madison Avenue. U.S. plots against Castro were not secret before JFK was killed, so there is no reason the Warren Commission should not have known about them. It didn't want to know or it would have followed its own leads.

The story about the alleged Castro speech at the Brazilian Embassy in Havana is a fake. AP did not do the faking, others did and AP was suckered into it. My work on this dates to 1967. I wrote it in 1968. I am absolutely without question about the evidence I have to support this, which is separate from analysis. I'm telling you about solid fact in my possession in your interest and in the country's.

There is no way I have of knowing whether Saffire knows what he says, whether he got it directly or indirectly from you or even whether you ~~xx~~ believe what he says. However, it does fit the pattern against which I tried to caution you.

Right now I'm saying it is not impossible that you are being taken in by and if Saffire is right about to become part of a disinformation operation. I don't think you want this to happen. I don't. That is why I write now.

Best regards,

Harold Weisberg